



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/582,287

01/11/2007

Zacharias Joseph Van Den Berg

A311061.6US

2845

36536 7590 07/29/2010  
WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS, LLP  
1715 AARON BRENNER DRIVE  
SUITE 800  
MEMPHIS, TN 38120-4367

EXAMINER

COOLEY, CHARLES E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/29/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/582,287	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VAN DEN BERG, ZACHARIAS JOSEPH	
	<b>Examiner</b> Charles E. Cooley	<b>Art Unit</b> 1797	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 June 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1797

## **NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION**

- 1. This application has been assigned to Technology Center 1700, Art Unit 1797 and the following will apply for this application:**

Please direct all written correspondence with the correct application serial number for this application to **Art Unit 1797**.

Telephone inquiries regarding this application should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or 1-866-217-9197 or to the Examiner at (571) 272-1139. All official facsimiles should be transmitted to the centralized fax receiving number 571-273-8300.

### ***Election/Restriction Requirement***

2. Applicant's election of Group II, claims 9-30 in the reply filed on 14 MAY 2010 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

3. Claims 1-8 are thereby withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

### ***Priority***

4. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). All of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

### ***Drawings***

5. The drawings are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - a. the drawings contain improper sectional views. The plane upon which a sectional view is taken should be indicated on the view from which the section is cut by a broken line. The ends of the broken line should be designated by Arabic or Roman numerals corresponding to the view number of the sectional view, and should have arrows to indicate the direction of sight (37 CFR 1.84(h)(3)). For example, Figure 2 should be a sectional view taken along line 2-2 in Figure 1 (not sectional line A-A). All sectional views should be corrected in accordance with 37 CFR 1.84(h)(3).

Applicant should also ensure a proper one-to-one correspondence between the specification and drawings in accordance with MPEP 608.01(g) and 37 CFR 1.84(f). The brief description of the drawings and the descriptive portion of the specification require revision in accordance with the above drawing objections.

Correction is required.

6. Applicant should verify that (1) all reference characters in the drawings are described in the detailed description portion of the specification and (2) all reference characters mentioned in the specification are included in the appropriate drawing Figure(s) as required by 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5).

### **INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES**

#### **Replacement Drawing Sheets**

Drawing changes must be made by presenting replacement figures which incorporate the desired changes and which comply with 37 CFR 1.84. An explanation of the

Art Unit: 1797

changes made must be presented either in the drawing amendments, or remarks, section of the amendment. Any replacement drawing sheet must be identified in the top margin as "Replacement Sheet" (37 CFR 1.121(d)) and include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even though only one figure may be amended. The figure or figure number of the amended drawing(s) must not be labeled as "amended." If the changes to the drawing figure(s) are not accepted by the examiner, applicant will be notified of any required corrective action in the next Office action. No further drawing submission will be required, unless applicant is notified.

Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and centered within the top margin.

### **Annotated Drawing Sheets**

A marked-up copy of any amended drawing figure, including annotations indicating the changes made, may be submitted or required by the examiner. The annotated drawing sheets must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Marked-up Drawings" and accompany the replacement sheets.

### **Timing of Corrections**

Applicant is required to submit acceptable corrected drawings within the time period set in the Office action. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings MUST be filed within the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period set for reply in the "Notice of Allowability." Extensions of time may NOT be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability.

### ***Specification***

7. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

8. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Art Unit: 1797

- a. Page 3, line 16 contains extraneous text "25" after "once".

Appropriate correction is required.

9. The title is acceptable.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph***

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 9-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 requires a claim to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Under *In re Hammack*, 427 F.2d 1378, 166 USPQ 204 (CCPA 1970) and *In re Moore*, 169 USPQ 236 (CCPA 1971), claims must be analyzed to determine their metes and bounds so that it is clear from the claim language what subject matter the claims encompass. This analysis must be performed in light of the applicable prior art and the disclosure. The definiteness of the claims is important to allow others who wish to enter the market place to ascertain the boundaries of protection that are provided by the claims. *Ex parte Kristensen*, 10 USPQ 2d 1701, 1703 (BPAI 1989).

One of the purposes of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, "is to provide those who would endeavor, in future enterprise, to approach the area circumscribed by the

Art Unit: 1797

claims of a patent, with adequate notice demanded by due process of law, so that they may more readily and accurately determine the boundaries of protection involved and evaluate the possibility of infringement and dominance.” *In re Hammack*, supra. As set forth in *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1217, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1030 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The statute requires that “[t]he specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.” A decision as to whether a claim is invalid under this provision requires a determination whether those skilled in the art would understand what is claimed. See *Shatterproof Glass Corp. v. Libbey-Owens Ford Co.*, 758 F.2d 613, 624, 225 USPQ 634, 641 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (claims must “reasonably apprise those skilled in the art” as to their scope and be “as precise as the subject matter permits.”).

12. The pending claims fail to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention and are therefore of indeterminate scope for the following reasons:

The claims are narrative in form and replete with indefinite, functional, and awkward/confusing language. The structure that goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. Many claim terms lack positive antecedent basis. Some claims are incomprehensible (e.g., see claim 12). Some claims refer to an element yet it is unclear if the same element is being recited (e.g., see lines 6 and 8 of claim 9 regarding the “the liquid intake” and “a liquid intake”).

13. Each pending claim should be thoroughly reviewed such that these and any other informalities are corrected so the claims may particularly point out and distinctly

Art Unit: 1797

claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

14. The terms used in this respect are given their broadest reasonable interpretation in their ordinary usage in context as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, in light of the written description in the specification, including the drawings, without reading into the claim any disclosed limitation or particular embodiment. See, e.g., *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2004); *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The Examiner interprets claims as broadly as reasonable in view of the specification, but does not read limitations from the specification into a claim. *Elekta Instr. S.A.v.O.U.R. Sci. Int'l, Inc.*, 214 F.3d 1302, 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2000). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. Inc. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.



**16. Claims 9-12 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alt et al. (US 4,534,654).**

The patent to Alt et al. discloses a liquid recirculation and transfer vessel layout (Figs. 1-5) comprising a liquid transfer facility holding vessel 54 submersibly holding a high volume and low pressure liquid transfer facility 20 that comprises a rotor type stirrer 31-33 mounted to rotate in a horizontal plane and connected to an overhead drive 60-65 suitable to rotate it at a conventional stirrer type speed of rotation and a stirrer housing 22-24 of which the liquid intake 41 is non-overhead and within which the stirrer is freely rotatably mounted while defining a liquid transfer zone 30 extending in a liquid flow promoting way between a liquid intake 41 mouthed in the a [sic] liquid transfer facility holding vessel 54 and a tangential liquid discharge 25, and a recirculation vessel 11 into which the liquid transfer facility 20 is arranged to discharge via a low elevation discharge port 27 owing to its discharge being in adequate close vicinity of the port if not registering with it while provision is made for the gravitational return flow of liquid via 29 from the recirculation vessel 11 to the liquid transfer facility holding vessel 54 and to and from at least one of which vessels liquid required for treatment is conventionally chargeable and treated liquid is removable; the stirrer incorporates a blade carrier 31 via which it is drivable that is fitted with a plurality of regularly circumferentially arranged radially extending liquid transfer blades 33; the housing 22-24 being inherently removable from the holding vessel; at least part of the housing of the transfer facility though to the effect of having enabled stirrer location there into from above, is independent of the remainder of the facility thus being independently installed against

Art Unit: 1797

displacement to the liquid transfer facility holding vessel as so accommodating it (Figs. 1-5); the liquid transfer facility being open to the environment (Fig. 3); a rotor shaft 57 encompassing sleeve 54; the return flow between the recirculating vessel and the liquid transfer facility holding vessel is via a high elevation return flow arrangement 28 in which the high elevation return flow arrangement is in the form of a return flow port at 29.

**17. Claims 9-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Kretschmer et al. (US 4416549) per the International Search Report of 15 SEP 2005.**

X	US 4 416 549 A (KRETSCHNER ET AL) 22 November 1983 (1983-11-22) the whole document	1-30
---	--	------

The examiner notes there are no arguments or claim amendments of record addressing this "X" reference in said search report.

**18. Claims 9-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Campolini et al. (US 4499562) per the International Search Report of 15 SEP 2005.**

X	US 4 499 562 A (CAMPOLINI ET AL) 12 February 1985 (1985-02-12) the whole document	1-30
---	---	------

The examiner notes there are no arguments or claim amendments of record addressing this "X" reference in said search report.

Art Unit: 1797

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

19. To determine whether subject matter would have been obvious, "the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved .... Such secondary considerations as commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, failure of others, etc., might be utilized to give light to the circumstances surrounding the origin of the subject matter sought to be patented."

*Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966).

The Supreme Court has noted:

Often, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue.

*KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740-41 (2007). "Under the correct analysis, any need or problem known in the field of endeavor at the time of invention and addressed by the patent can provide a reason for combining the elements in the manner claimed." (Id. at 1742).

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1797

21. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**22. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alt et al. (US 4,534,654) in view of Kihara (US 5,505,541).**

Alt et al. discloses the recited subject matter (Figs. 1-5) but does not disclose the elevating means. The patent to Kihara discloses a submersible stirrer 33 mounted in a surrounding housing 2 wherein the housing 2 has elevating means 6 supporting the stirrer above the floor of the vessel (Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to have provided the stirrer housing of Alt et al. with elevating means as disclosed by Kihara for the purpose of securely elevating and supporting the stirrer housing in place above the floor of the vessel.

### ***Conclusion***

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 1797

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Cooley in Art Unit 1797 whose telephone number is (571) 272-1139. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Additional assistance can be obtained via the Ombudsman Pilot Program is designed to enhance the USPTO's ability to assist applicants and/or their representatives with issues that arise during patent application prosecution. More specifically, if there is a breakdown in the normal prosecution process, the Ombudsman Pilot Program can assist in getting the process back on track. See <http://www.uspto.gov/patents/ombudsman.jsp> . If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Charles E. Cooley/

Charles E. Cooley  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1797

28 July 2010